Table Summary:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Collision Technique/ Table Size** | **563** | **719** | **911** |
| **Linear Probing** | 2.7 | 2.1 | 1.69 |
| **Quadratic probing** | 5.45 | 4.32 | 3.4 |

Chart:

Summary Paragraph:

I believe the linear probe was much more practical for this type of experiment because the data set wasn’t really large. If the data set was larger than the quadratic probe would be the way to go. I also believe that for linear probe the table size doesn’t matter while for the quadratic probe the table size must be a prime number. In comparison to the other experiments I believe that using a hash table is much for efficient because you are putting the keys into the table rather than the actual data. This would also decrease the memory needed for a hash table since you are only inserting keys into it. I also believe each type of experiment has It pros and cons. The linked list is much easier to implement while the binary search tree is easier to follow. The only problem I ran into while doing this was deleting the duplicate words.